

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the above-identified Office Action. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the proposed amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Rejections

The rejection of claims 1-20 35 USC § 103 as being allegedly obvious in light of Nozaki et al., is respectfully traversed.

This rejection states that Nozaki et al. discloses a photoresist composition comprising as additives unpolymerized compounds found in column 31, lines 36 – column 33, line 5 wherein these compounds disclose structures which meet the claimed second compound of claim 2, (see compound (XLVI)). The rejection then states that Nozaki et al. discloses that if the non-polymeric compounds are used an alkali-soluble resin is added as a combination to given the required resist characteristics to the resist composition (column 32, lines 59-65).

The rejection then asserts that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill to use any of the compounds listed in column 31, line 36 – column 33, line 5 as a dissolution inhibitor with a base resin and an acid generator in a photoresist composition with a reasonable expectation of the same or similar results to those recited in NOZAKI et al.

However, it is submitted that the amendment to claim 2 differentiates over the disclosure of NOZAKI. More specifically, the formula XLVI shown in column 31 is such that Z can be an adamantyl group or derivatives thereof (column 26, lines 35-36). However, there is no disclosure of the Z groups meeting the claims requirements that Y and Z are H, OH, F, Cl, Br, R or COOR, where Y may be Z, or Y and Z may be introduced in a single adamantyl structure and R represents a straight or branched alkyl group having 1 to 8 carbon atoms, wherein if Y is H then Z is one of OH, F, Cl, Br, R or COOR, and if Z is H, then Y is one of OH, F, Cl, Br, R or COOR, and wherein if Y is R

then Z is one of H, OH, F, Cl, Br or COOR and if Z is R then Y is one of H, OH, F, Cl, Br or COOR.

The rejection is silent as to how these features are disclosed or suggested.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the above claim amendments overcome the rejections which have been made in this Office Action. Favorable reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of this application are therefore respectfully requested. Should any outstanding issues remain, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned telephonically so that resolution of these matters can be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Date October 29, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 22428

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (202) 672-5327

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,674

Keith J. Townsend
Registration No. 40,358